

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 7-21 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1 has been amended as shown on pages 2 of the Reply. Claims 3 and 6 have been cancelled. Additionally, claims 22-54 have been withdrawn.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-17 and 21 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-17 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Newell *et al.* (2003/0219226). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested since Newell *et al.* fails to teach or suggest all aspects of subject claims.

A single prior art reference anticipates a patent claim only if it *expressly or inherently describes each and every limitation* set forth in the patent claim. *Trintec Industries, Inc. v. Top-U.S.A. Corp.*, 295 F.3d 1292, 63 USPQ2d 1597 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *See Verdegaaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). *The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.* *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Applicants' claimed invention relates to systems and methods providing rich previews of documents, projects, and other digitally stored items *via* automated decomposition of such items in the form of graphical representations that are rendered by an associated user interface. To this end, independent claim 1 recites *a decomposition component that automatically segregates at least one information item into a collection of subcomponents relating to the item by analyzing properties of the item including at least one of a type of the item, an item structure and an item content and the interface component includes a preview display enabling users to inspect sets of items, such as text applications, projects, tasks, presentation or graphics applications, and email documents.* Newell *et al.* neither teaches nor suggests such novel aspects.

Newell *et al.* provides methods and system for accessing video data stored on a storage device. A processor is used to generate a preview sequence comprising video sequences extracted from each video programme in the storage device. The preview sequence contains a plurality of video sequence and other textual or graphical data related to the programmes

displayed. At page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner incorrectly asserts that Newell *et al.* substantially teaches a decomposition component that automatically segregates at least one information item into a collection of subcomponents relating to the item *by analyzing properties of the item including at least one of a type of the item, an item structure and an item content.* The cited portion of the reference provides for shape of video sequences in the grid (rectangular or any other shape) being decided by metadata and user preferences. Metadata is supplementary to the main data, that is being transmitted and acts as a means for describing the main data (Paragraph 29). Hence Newell *et al.* provides for grid of video sequences to be rectangular or other desired shape that is decided by metadata and user preferences, and provides only preview of video sequences. Nowhere does Newell *et al.* teach or suggest *analyzing properties of the item including at least one of a type of the item, an item structure and an item content* let alone providing for previewing sequences of *text applications, projects, tasks, presentation or graphics applications, and email documents*

At page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner again incorrectly asserts that Newell *et al.* substantially teaches that *the interface component includes a preview display enabling users to inspect sets of items, such as text applications, projects, tasks, presentation or graphics applications and email documents.* The cited portion of the reference provides for employing a mask or graphics overlay to obscure one or more elements of the preview sequence that are invalid due to update process. The mask comprises an opaque section so that invalid data in the preview sequence is obscured and can not be viewed by the user. The opaque portion of the graphics overlay display text, an icon or a still image related to the video program that will eventually be inserted in that element of the grid so that valid navigation information is available for the user at all times (*See* paragraph 47). Hence, Newell *et al.* merely provides for sequences for video data only and nowhere does it teach or suggest *preview of text applications, projects, tasks, presentation or graphics applications, and email documents.*

In view of at least the foregoing, it is readily apparent that Newell *et al.* fails to teach or suggest all aspects of the claimed invention. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection of independent claim 1 (and the claims that depend there from) should be withdrawn.

II. Rejection of Claims 18-20 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Newell *et al.* (2003/0219226) and Card *et al.* (2005/0005246). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reasons. Newell *et al.* and Card *et al.* either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all features of the subject claims.

To reject claims in an application under §103, an examiner must establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. A *prima facie* case of obviousness is established by a showing of three basic criteria. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, **the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.** See MPEP §706.02(j). The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must be found in the prior art and not based on the applicant's disclosure. See *In re Vaack*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). (emphasis added).

Applicant's claimed invention relates to systems and methods providing rich previews of documents, projects, and other digitally stored items *via* automated decomposition of such items in the form of graphical representations that are rendered by an associated user interface. To this end, dependent claim 18 recites *the interface component provides an exploded view previewer to structure documents in an isometric three-space representation, decomposed into a set of pages comprising the document, sequenced from front to back.* Newell *et al.* and Card *et al.* are both silent regarding such novel aspects of the claimed invention.

Newell *et al.* provides methods and system for accessing video data stored on a storage device. A processor is used to generate a preview sequence comprising video sequences extracted from each video programme in the storage device. The preview sequence contains a plurality of video sequence and other textual or graphical data related to the programmes displayed. In addition to the aforementioned deficiencies of the primary reference with respect to independent claim 1, the Examiner concedes that Newell *et al.* does not teach all limitations recited in the subject independent claims, and attempts to cure the deficiencies of Newell *et al.*

with Card *et al.* However, Card *et al.* merely relates to displaying images of a virtual three-dimensional book having one or more virtual page. Images of the virtual three-dimensional book are produced on a display system; and this reference does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Newell *et al.*

At page 9 of the Office Action, the Examiner incorrectly asserts that Card *et al.* substantially teaches the interface component provides *an exploded view previewer* to structure documents in an isometric three-space representation, decomposed into a set of pages comprising the document, sequenced from front to back. The cited portion of reference provides for displaying images of a virtual three-dimensional book having one or more virtual pages. The use of texture maps of different fidelity is used to allow more rapid display and motion of the pages and provides tabs for navigating to virtual pages (paragraph 77, 92-94). Hence Card *et al.* provides for a three dimensional book having virtual pages and displaying those pages. However Card *et al.* nowhere teaches or suggests *an exploded view previewer* to structure documents in an isometric three-space representation, decomposed into a set of pages comprising the document, sequenced from front to back.

In view of at least the foregoing, it is readily apparent that both Newell *et al.* and Card *et al.* fail to teach or suggest all aspects of the claimed invention. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection of dependent claims 18-20 should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP461US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROC & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/

Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROC & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731